

DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

# **CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY**

PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91125

## **GALLOPING**

J. Kent Clark



**HUMANITIES WORKING PAPER 166**

April 1997

## **Galloping**

J. Kent Clark

"Galloping" is chapter eighteen in my biography of Thomas Wharton, 5th Baron, 1st Earl, and 1st Marquess of Wharton (*Tom* Wharton to most of political England and to his biographer). The chapter covers some crucial stages in the process by which James II committed political suicide, and it follows some important events in the fortunes of the Whartons. The time-span covered is roughly a year, from the spring of 1686 through January 1687, with brief glances at 1688 and 1705. The table of abbreviations and the short-title bibliography apply to the whole book, not merely this segment.

## **GALLOPING**

J. Kent Clark

On 10 March 1686, there was a perceptible shift in the political wind and a silent recalculation of odds all over England. On that date King James proclaimed a general amnesty for the crimes committed against him and his brother Charles. There were exceptions, of course. The unforgiven included officers in Monmouth's army, conspirators under indictment, convicts transported to the plantations after Sedgemoor, and about one hundred sixty persons named in the proclamation.<sup>1</sup> Most dissidents, however, could breathe freely. Even men who had fled overseas could avoid prosecution if they returned by 29 September and appeared before a Justice of the Peace.

Besides its announced purpose of quieting the nation and rendering opposition less desperate, the proclamation had an unstated but easily discernible aim. It was a significant move by the King towards conciliating the Dissenters. A clause in the decree which pardoned attendance at "unlawful meetings and conventicles," as well as treasons and misprisions, made this purpose clear. Having been thwarted by his old friends, the Anglicans, James was beginning to explore a possible alliance with his old enemies--the people whom his party had dubbed "the fanatics." And the chance that he might win active support was another factor that entered into the complex game of handicapping the political future.

The King's proclamation, which was followed three days later by his order to "stop and discharge" all criminal proceedings against Quakers,<sup>2</sup> marked another turn in Wharton fortunes. Immediately it meant that Lord Wharton could relax. In no danger from the

government as long as he returned to England by late September, he felt free to leave Emmerich, spend a week or two at Aix, and make a leisurely tour of the German states, including Brandenburg.<sup>3</sup> Eventually, the King's developing stance as an apostle of toleration and a friend of Dissent would mean that Lord Wharton, as an influential patron of Nonconformist ministers, would be wooed by the government. It would mean also that Tom and Henry would be welcome at Whitehall, Windsor Palace, and St. James's.

Meanwhile, on 12 March, came the counterpoint to the King's overtures toward fanatics. James instructed Attorney General Sir Robert Sawyer to prepare "a bill" authorizing about ninety Catholic lords and gentleman (English, Irish, and Scots) to visit London. This order implicitly nullified for its beneficiaries the joint resolution of the Houses and the royal proclamations of 1678 which forbade Catholics to come within ten miles of the town.<sup>4</sup> The edict further authorized the lords and gentlemen, listed by name, to appear before the King, the Queen, and the Queen Dowager "without taking the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy." Finally and most significantly, the designated men were to be "dispensed" from "taking the said Oaths...and from all penalties, notwithstanding former statutes."<sup>5</sup> In short, they were to be pardoned in advance for violating the Test Act and the other penal laws against Catholics.

On the day James issued orders to his Attorney General, he also instructed his Archbishops to stop proceedings against some two hundred recusants in the County of Lincoln.<sup>6</sup> Though perhaps not as dramatic as the political indulgences bestowed upon Catholic grandees, the instruction to the churchmen was a reminder of a vital fact. According to the law, James was head of the Church of England. As far as civil government went, he might or might not have the power to "dispense with" penalties annexed to statutes. That question would soon be decided in his favor by his judges and later decided against him by the Revolution. In matters of church government, however, there were large areas where his authority was unquestioned, and the fact that he himself did not believe in his own supremacy did not affect the legal position. He had the power to appoint, or not appoint,<sup>7</sup> archbishops, bishops, college heads, and certain other Anglican officials; he also had the right to oversee Church discipline. When he gave his bishops and archbishops instructions, they were obliged to listen. On 5 March he had instructed Archbishops Sancroft and Dolben to keep their clergy

from preaching on controversial doctrines and political matters. Ministers were to concentrate instead upon "the duty of subjection and obedience" and upon the "moral duties" of Christians.<sup>8</sup> The instructions did not say in so many words that Anglican preachers were not to criticize the King, his government, or his religion, but the intent was clear enough.

Politically King James's decisions on Church matters were often unwise. Certainly his failure to abide by the Tory version of "original contract"--the promise to observe the laws protecting the Church of England--would help to drive him from the throne. Legally, however, his orders were often impeccable. And the fact that his ecclesiastical subordinates owned his supremacy and had preached loyalty and obedience at the top of their lungs made their positions excruciating as he hacked away at their establishment.

In the early spring of 1686, then, the outlines of the political future were essentially clear. The King's Bench had not yet declared, in the case of Sir Edward Hales, that James could legally employ Catholic officers; James had not yet appointed an Ecclesiastical Commission to discipline clergymen who insisted upon preaching against his religion; and the royal regiments were not yet drawn up on Hounslow Heath to remind Londoners in particular and the country in general that resistance was out of the question. The strategies, however, by which James would attempt to strengthen his authority and establish his co-religionists in positions of power were obvious enough. There was only one uncertainty: how fast would he move?

Several years later, John Oldmixon attributed James's ultimate defeat to haste. If the King had used "cool methods," Oldmixon explained, "he might easily have worked the English out of their laws and liberties." But fortunately for England, "he was for galloping" and thus "saved this nation at the expense of his crown and dignity."<sup>9</sup>

Though James had not hit full stride in the spring of 1686, by early May he was already moving too fast for his friend John Evelyn, who observed sadly: "All engines [are] now at work to bring in popery amain, which God in mercy prevent."<sup>10</sup> James was also worrying his faithful friend Sir John Reresby. "The King," Reresby wrote, "having got a Jesuist for his confessor went on faster than formerly in promoting the Roman Catholic religion."<sup>11</sup>

Reresby and Evelyn would soon have stronger reasons for anxiety. The summer

brought what the spring had promised. On 16 June the Hales case was tried, and five days later eleven of the King's twelve judges agreed that James could grant dispensations for breaches of the Test Act. On 27 June there was a "general rendezvous" of the royal forces encamped on Hounslow Heath. First assembled in late May, the troops had been reinforced on 19 June by a train of thirty cannon, ostentatiously drawn through London from the Tower.<sup>12</sup> And on 15 July came the appointment of the famous "Commission for Ecclesiastical Affairs" (Commissarii ad Causas Ecclesiasticas)<sup>13</sup>--the King's instrument for muzzling strident preachers and asserting his authority over the English Church.

Headed by Lord Chancellor Jeffreys, the Commission first met on 3 August and on 9 August began the process of suspending Henry Compton, Bishop of London. Compton had made an enemy of James by leading the attack in the House of Lords upon the appointment of Catholic army officers. For this offense he had been removed from the Privy Council ("struck out by order of his Majesty") on 23 December 1685;<sup>14</sup> and in June 1686 he had made himself vulnerable to ecclesiastical discipline by disobeying the King's order to suspend Dr. John Sharp, Rector of St. Giles-in-the-Fields. Sharp had ignored James's "directions concerning preachers." In a sermon on 9 May, he had not only preached on a controversial topic but had made (according to the royal warrant) "unbecoming reflections" on the King's religion, thereby disposing St. Giles parishioners to "disobedience, schism, and rebellion."<sup>15</sup> On 14 June, James ordered Bishop Compton to suspend Sharp out of hand. Compton refused on the ground that he could not do so without a formal hearing on the charges.<sup>16</sup> Thus on 9 August Compton found himself before the King's Commission in proceedings which riveted the attention of the nation.

The Commissioners granted two postponements and held two sessions on the Compton case--the first demonstration of their power over Anglican officialdom. Finally, on 6 September, after dismissing the contention that they were an illegal body<sup>17</sup> and the plea that a bishop could not suspend a rector without a trial, Jeffreys and his colleagues removed the bishop from all episcopal functions. Both the verdict and the "extraordinary way of proceeding," as Evelyn noted sadly, were "universally resented."<sup>18</sup> They were also disquieting. If the King was not yet galloping, he had at least reached a brisk trot.

For Tom Wharton personally the King's maneuvers of 1686 would have important long-range effects. The Ecclesiastical Commission furnished him with a rogues' gallery of political targets. Two of these were Lord Treasurer Laurence Hyde, Earl of Rochester, and John Sheffield, later Duke of Buckingham.<sup>19</sup> Both men found it difficult to remove the stigma of having abetted James's attack upon the Anglican establishment. Years later, after Buckingham, Rochester, and their ally the Earl of Nottingham had been removed from office by Queen Anne and while the House of Lords was debating the Tory contention that the Church was in danger, Tom (then Lord Wharton) reminded his old opponents of their malefactions. To find out what the dangers to the Church might be, he said, he had looked into *The Memorial of the Church of England*,<sup>20</sup> the literary oracle of the Tory party.

I find there [Tom reported with elaborate irony] the only danger is that the *D.* of *B.*, the *E.* of *R.* and *E.* of *N.* are out of place. What these letters are, God knows. They may be charms and spells. But there was a time when the *D.* of *B.* and *E.* of *R.* were in Ecclesiastical Commission to suspend and deprive the bishops and clergy, and then the Church was very safe.<sup>21</sup>

The Commission included two other embarrassments to the Church party: Thomas Spratt, Bishop of Rochester, and Nathaniel Crew, Bishop of Durham.<sup>22</sup> Archbishop Sancroft, pleading age and infirmity, had wisely declined James's appointment to serve on the coercive body.<sup>23</sup> Spratt and Crew made no difficulties. They served through the Compton affair and later through the King's attacks upon Cambridge and Oxford. In April 1687, when James issued his celebrated Declaration of Indulgence, suspending (he said) the Test Act altogether, Anglicans viewed the edict as both illegal and threatening--a maneuver to bring Catholics to power under the guise of toleration. Instead of remaining stonily mute in the face of government pressure, as did most of his colleagues, Crew actually sent an address of thanks to the King.<sup>24</sup> And in 1688 when the King re-issued his Declaration and ordered the Anglican clergy to read it in their churches, Spratt was one of the very few who obeyed. To the disgust and contempt of his colleagues, seven of whom were sent to the Tower for protesting, Spratt caused the Declaration to be read in Westminster Abbey.<sup>25</sup>

But if Spratt and Crew made love to their employments and set a formidable example as

opportunists, they were far surpassed in the art by their fellow Commissioner Robert Spencer, Earl of Sunderland, the King's Secretary of State. Where others merely turned their coats, Sunderland (to borrow Byron's great metaphor) turned his skin. In the first few days of James's reign, Sunderland accepted a huge pension from Louis XIV--which he continued to earn throughout the reign. Later, to outbid Rochester and Clarendon, the King's brothers-in-law, for the King's favor and to hold his ground against the Jesuit Edward Petre, he turned Catholic. His service on the Ecclesiastical Commission was perhaps the least of his political sins. In any case, his continued presence there after his conversion furnished ammunition to the King's enemies, who argued that the inclusion of a Catholic on a commission to discipline Anglican clergymen was patently illegal.<sup>26</sup> Finally, in panic as invasion threatened, Sunderland dithered so ineffectually that on 26 October 1688, he was dismissed by James. He retired briefly to the country and then escaped to Holland.<sup>27</sup>

At the Revolution Sunderland was infamous as one of James's "evil councillors"--almost as obnoxious as Jeffreys. Like Jeffreys and James himself, however, he had done wonders for constitutional government. By educating Englishmen, including high Tories, to the dangers of "prerogative," "dispensing powers," "standing armies," and ecclesiastical commissions, James and his henchmen inadvertently turned most of the King's extra-legal powers into history. The Revolution Settlement with its consequent Bill of Rights would not only abolish the dispensing power as it had been used by James and prohibit standing armies in time of peace without the approval of Parliament; it would also prescribe a test act for English kings and queens. To prevent "royal supremacy" from being used again to attack the Church of England, Parliament, with the assent of William and Mary, would enact a law that no Catholic nor anyone married to a Catholic could be king or queen of England.<sup>28</sup>

In the autumn of 1686, of course, all these developments lay in an opaque future. In the immediate present, Tom Wharton could not know that besides furnishing him with a convenient set of villains the King's Commission would provide an invaluable ally. This was the Bishop of London. In prosecuting Bishop Henry Compton, James and his Commissioners had made a gross mistake. Two years later he would be one of the "Immortal Seven" who invited the Prince of Orange to come with an army and stop James from galloping.<sup>29</sup>



What Tom did know that autumn was that the action against John Sharp was both literally and figuratively close to home. St. Giles, where Sharp gave his provocative sermon, was about a hundred yards from Lord Wharton's town house--so close, in fact, that Lord Wharton complained about the noisy bells and caused the apertures of the bell-tower to be louvered.<sup>30</sup> It was at St. Giles that Tom's half-brother William had been baptized in 1662, that his sister Philadelphia had been married in 1679, and that Andrew Marvell, a great friend of the Whartons, had been buried in 1678.<sup>31</sup> St. Giles was also near Tom's own town house on the east side of Soho Square, in what was then a Whig enclave; and the fact that the attack was led by Tom's personal enemy Lord Chancellor Jeffreys made the psychological distance even closer. For the moment, St. Giles-in-the-Fields and its rector John Sharp (later Archbishop of York) had become symbols of the King's determination to silence his critics.<sup>32</sup>

Tom Wharton also knew, as the King increased his pace, that James had good reason to hurry. He was almost fifty-three years old--a considerable age for the time--and the successor to the throne was his daughter Mary. Mary was a faithful Anglican, and her husband, the redoubtable Prince of Orange, was leader of the "Protestant Interest" on the Continent. Mary and William were virtually certain to reverse any pro-Catholic policies; and while they might favor a wide spectrum of toleration, including toleration for Catholics, they would undoubtedly remove all Catholics from the government. If, then, James was to "establish" his co-religionists so solidly that they could not be dislodged and if he was to retain the faintest hope of recapturing England for Rome, he was compelled to move quickly.

Understandably, the motives that impelled James to gallop impelled most of his subjects to sit quietly. The fact that there was no popish heir was one of the silent considerations that had allowed Anglicans to support James with enthusiasm. Queen Mary Beatrice, James's wife, had produced five short-lived children (one boy and four girls); she had suffered two miscarriages since her last conception; and there was no reason to suppose that she would produce a healthy son to threaten the succession.<sup>33</sup> Providence, it seemed, had placed an Anglican scepter in James's hands, and Providence could be trusted to remove him before he fatally damaged the Church and kingdom or found some way to change the succession.<sup>34</sup>

This state of affairs also urged caution upon wise politicians. James's judges might

proclaim to their hearts' content that the law was the King's and that he could suspend it or dispense with legal penalties at his pleasure; but future judges and parliaments were apt to disagree sharply, and officials who obeyed "illegal" orders might ultimately find themselves in deep trouble.<sup>35</sup> Calculating men were also impelled to insure themselves with William and Mary. Once Monmouth had been removed from the political scene, the future appeared to lie at the Hague. By letter, by agent, or in person, Englishmen began creating or renewing ties with the heirs apparent. Finally, the prospect of a short reign and a Protestant successor helped convince Pope Innocent XI and many English Catholics that James should move slowly. He was more likely, they reasoned, to evoke a violent anti-Catholic reaction than to establish Catholics in power.

Meanwhile, in mid-September 1686, a few days after the Ecclesiastical Commission had suspended Bishop Compton and a few days before the deadline for claiming amnesty, Lord Wharton returned from his European travels to his house at St. Giles. He found a political scene dramatically different from the one he had left, hastily, the previous September. Prosecution of Dissenters and harassment of conventicles had not entirely ceased, but the process was slowing. King James had been granting dispensations piecemeal to individual congregations, and there were rumors that he intended to suspend all penal laws.<sup>36</sup> Lord Wharton's friend Doctor William Denton heard a report, in fact, that Lord Wharton had come home "to do a job toward toleration."<sup>37</sup> Denton could not believe the rumor, but its existence reflected the new state of affairs, as the King, who had begun by pardoning Quakers and Anabaptists, was making overtures towards Presbyterians and Independents. In the altered political climate Lord Wharton found himself safe beyond any need for amnesty--secure enough to continue making expensive repairs and additions to his buildings at St. Giles.<sup>38</sup>

One thing that had not altered during Lord Wharton's absence was the behavior of his sons Henry and Goodwin. On 2 February Henry had killed Lieutenant Robert Moxam, a fellow officer in the Duke of Norfolk's regiment, in what was generally called a duel but perhaps more accurately described as a tavern brawl--"a drunken rencontre at the Blue Posts."<sup>39</sup> King James was reported "incensed" by the episode, but the coroner's jury ruled that Henry had acted in self defense.<sup>40</sup> Later, and more creditably, Henry would intervene to stop a

duel at Leicester Fields between Captain Alan Bellingham and Captain Simon Pack after Bellingham had been wounded.<sup>41</sup>

Goodwin, who had visited his father on the Continent, had returned to his mentor and spiritual advisor Mary Parish and had spent the balance of the summer in searching, unsuccessfully, for hidden treasures in the London area. His material failures, however, were partially balanced by his psychic achievements. He had learned to remember dreams in great detail and he had been assured that many of these were genuine visions. Some of Goodwin's vivid dreams concerned his brother Henry, whom he had often tried to reform. One vision informed him that Henry did not have long to live, and a second added that Henry would die violently. This depressing information Goodwin considered antecedently probable, considering his incorrigible brother's "wild way of living."<sup>42</sup>

But Goodwin was more concerned about Tom. He could not help feeling guilty about his love affair with his brother's wife, in spite of the fact that he and Anne had never quite committed adultery and of the assurances he had received via the angels and Mary Parish that Anne, on her death bed, had explained his essential innocence. In a final, tearful scene, Mary said, Anne had cleared both herself and Goodwin of guilt and removed Tom's unjust suspicions. Since Anne's death, however, Tom had remained distant. He never apologized to Goodwin for having suspected him, as Goodwin thought he should, and he began to appear in Goodwin's anxiety visions. Twice, Goodwin learned in dreams, Tom had actually planned to kill him. Fortunately, as Mary explained after consultation with the angels, Tom's "murderous design" was "wearing off," and he would soon undergo a complete change of heart. Eventually, another vision informed Goodwin, Tom would help him become Knight of the Shire for Bucks.<sup>43</sup>

Outside Goodwin's dreams, in the prosaic world ruled by King James, Tom's behavior was a good deal less melodramatic. In April, more or less as usual, Tom had won the 12-stone race at Brackley.<sup>44</sup> This victory may have been less satisfying than his triumph at Newmarket in October 1684, when his gray gelding beat Sidney Godolphin's horse in three consecutive heats;<sup>45</sup> but the Brackley plate, worth eighty pounds, was more valuable than the average prize and it was always good to win a horse race.

In April Tom also arranged to lease Danvers House in Chelsea to Christopher, Viscount Hatton. The house had been occupied for several years by John Robartes, Earl of Radnor, for the then-impressive sum of £130 per year.<sup>46</sup> Radnor had died the previous July, and now at the request of Daniel Finch, Earl of Nottingham, who had recently married Lord Hatton's daughter, Tom agreed that Hatton might rent the property. Both Nottingham and Hatton were unwavering Tories, and it was perhaps a sign of the times that Tom should write Nottingham, his once and future enemy, with a warmth beyond the demands of business and gentility. With absolutism beginning to threaten the nation, Tom could remember that Tories were after all Englishmen and that he might need allies presently.

My Lord {Tom wrote}, I am very glad anything I have can be of service to your lordship or to any of your friends and have...sent an order to Mr. East (who looks after my little concerns at Chelsea) that my lord Hatton have possession given him there, as your Lordship hath commanded me, and I beg of you to believe that I am in all things within my power your lordship's most faithful humble servant.<sup>47</sup>

For a time at least, Tom was less friendly with another Tory nobleman. This was Charles Dormer, Earl of Carnarvon, who lived at Eythrope House, a mile or so southeast of Winchendon, and owned a good deal of property in the area.<sup>48</sup> In early October, Tom and Henry, along with Robert Leke, Earl of Scarsdale, and Robert Spencer, Lord Spencer, staged some sort of raid at Eythrope. According to "country talk," they "whipped" the Earl, "did some other peccadillos of that kind in his castle," and then rode off before Captain Henry Bertie arrived with help.<sup>49</sup>

What actually happened at Eythrope is not clear. The fact that there were no serious repercussions, either in the courts or on the dueling field, seems to indicate that the country talk of whipping was exaggerated and that the "bravos" were perpetrating some crude, tasteless, and probably drunken prank. And the fact that Scarsdale was a moderate Tory and that Spencer, the son of the Tory-cum-Opportunist Earl of Sunderland, was about to turn Catholic seems to show that the peccadillos, however stupid and disgraceful, were non-political. Where Tom and Henry were concerned, the episode sounds as if the return of their father from Europe had transformed them once more into brainless adolescents. It did nothing

to improve their reputations.

Whatever happened at Eythrope, the neighborhood shrugged off the affair. By 29 October, when Tom was once again in the country, dining at Middle Claydon with his friends Sir Ralph Verney, Alexander Denton, Francis Knollys, and the Edmund Verneys, senior and junior,<sup>50</sup> the Carnarvon escapade had passed from country talk, or at least from country correspondence. There were public events a great deal more pressing. One of these, the appointment on 8 October<sup>51</sup> of Richard Talbot, Earl of Tyrconnel, to the King's Privy Council, was particularly significant. It marked a stage in the process by which the Catholic Tyrconnel would replace the Anglican Clarendon as head of the King's government in Ireland.

The process had begun in March with the appointment of Tyrconnel as Lieutenant-General of the Irish forces. Instructed to remodel the Irish army and introduce Catholic officers, he set about with a will to dismiss Protestants and enroll Catholics.<sup>52</sup> Concurrently, the King, to the dismay of his Lord Lieutenant Clarendon, began remodeling corporations and appointing Catholic judges and the magistrates.<sup>53</sup> As the summer wore on, it became clear that Clarendon was being reduced to a figurehead and that the real power in Ireland would be exercised by Sunderland and Tyrconnel. This perception was reinforced on 9 June, when Tyrconnel was appointed to the Irish Privy Council, along with three other Catholics, and it became more obvious still when he was made a Privy Councillor in England.<sup>54</sup> Naturally, Tyrconnel's growing power worried Englishmen in England and dismayed Englishmen in Ireland.

The King's insistence upon keeping his Catholic officers in defiance of the Test Act and maintaining a large standing army had cost him the support of his English Parliament. It had produced anxiety and mistrust among his Protestant subjects, who concluded that the army was to keep them quiet at home, not to determine the balance of power on the Continent--and certainly not to contain Louis XIV. They could console themselves, however, with the knowledge that despite its infusion of popish officers, the army consisted principally of Englishmen. Though radicals might proclaim that it was a collection of mercenaries who would fight against Magna Carta, loyalists might still hope that it would not support popery and arbitrary power.

But Tyrconnel's remodeled Irish army added an extra level of concern.<sup>55</sup> An army of Irish Catholics, Englishmen feared, would be happy to help the King coerce his English subjects, and it would be happier still to drive Protestant landholders out of Ireland. The King might promise to confirm the property settlements established by the English Parliament after the Restoration; these left English owners, both resident and absentee, in possession of their Irish estates. But Englishmen had much more confidence in an army of Irish Protestants than in the word of King James. The sight of Tyrconnel, a zealous and outspoken enemy of Protestant supremacy, at the head of a predominantly popish army was sobering. The lively possibility that the King would make him Lord Lieutenant or Lord Deputy was frightening. Nervous Anglo-Irishmen began leaving for England.

The Whartons had a special reason to keep a sharp watch on Tyrconnel and on the King's attacks upon Irish corporations. During the Interregnum, in the aftermath of the Irish Rebellion, Lord Wharton had acquired considerable property in Westmeath and Carlow; and in the jostling for possession after the Restoration he had been able to keep most of it.<sup>56</sup> Now after twenty years of security, he felt his titles threatened once more. Land values were falling and confiscation might be just over the horizon--a royal decree or two away.

At last on 1 January 1687 King James fulfilled the gloomy expectations of his Protestant subjects. He decided to appoint Tyrconnel Lord Deputy. This decision Clarendon learned in a curt note from Sunderland.

The King intends you should forthwith come into England and constitute the Earl of Tyrconnel Lord Deputy. He will be in Ireland before the end of this month and his Majesty's intention is you should give up the government to him a week after his arrival.<sup>57</sup>

On 7 January, in another short announcement, James explained to his Privy Council that he was removing Clarendon's brother Rochester from the office of Lord Treasurer.<sup>58</sup> He did not need to explain that Rochester, who had reached the limits of his elasticity, had refused to turn Catholic. Now a clog to the King's policy of establishing Catholics in government, Rochester had been outmaneuvered by Sunderland, whose elasticity had no limits. Nor did James need to explain to the politically aware--and certainly not to the Whartons--that the

appointment of Tyrconnel and the dismissal of the Hyde brothers was another blow to the Protestant establishment. The King had begun to gallop in earnest.

He had also provoked what eventually turned out to be a devastating reaction from Tom Wharton. Years later, in the reign of Queen Anne, Tom, then Earl of Wharton, would be Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. Now he was simply a Whig MP watching the King antagonize his subjects. But he was also a witty MP, and the appointment of Tyrconnel inspired him to some stanzas of doggerel verse that encapsulated the fears of the Anglo-Irish and the growing dismay of the King's Tory friends. Composed from the point of view of an Irish peasant who would exult in the expulsion of the English, the song began:

Ho, brother Teague, dost hear the decree  
Lilliburlero, bullen a-la  
That we shall have a new Debitie  
Lilliburlero, bullen a-la

After several verses of comment upon Talbot and the new order, which would bring the Irish "commissions gillore"<sup>59</sup> and hang the English and their "Magno Carto," the song ended triumphantly,

Now, now de heretics all go down  
Lilliburlero bullen a-la  
By Chreish and St. Patrick the nation's our own  
Lilliburlero bullen a-la.  
Lero, lero, lero, lero,  
Lilliburlero bullen a-la  
Lero, lero, lero, lero  
lilliburlero bullen-a-la<sup>60</sup>

What the mocking pseudo-Irish refrain lacked in sense it made up in rhythm. English armies, both real and fictional, would march to it for years to come. And one phrase of the song, "Protestant wind," which had once described the wind that frustrated the Spanish Armada, would take on new meanings. It was this wind, one verse said, that was keeping Tyrconnel in England, away from his Irish admirers.<sup>61</sup> A few months later it would become the wind that brought the Dutch fleet and army to Torbay.

For the time being, Tom's verses merely smoldered, as if the song had a sputtering

fuse, It was not until the autumn of 1688, after the King had made another batch of crucial blunders (and perhaps after the verses had been set to a catchier tune), that "Lilliburlero" swept the country like wildfire. The first genuine song hit in recorded history, it would help, as Tom later boasted, to drive James II out of three kingdoms.



## NOTES

1. The Proclamation appeared in *London Gazette*, No. 2120, 11-16 Mar. 1685[6]. Among prominent dissidents excepted by name were John Wildman, Sir William Waller, Slingsby Bethel, Francis Charlton, John Trenchard, Charles Gerard, Earl of Macclesfield, George Speke, Robert Ferguson, Aaron Smith, and Titus Oates. Also excepted were some forty women from Taunton. These included the so-called "Maids of Taunton," who were left unpardoned until they had "compounded" with the agent of the Queen's maids of honor--until, that is, they had bought their freedom. *CSPD*, James II, ii, 33, 63-64.
2. *CSPD*, James II, ii, 71. "Warrant to the Attorney General to cause such of our subjects called Quakers, who are in prison for not coming to Church or for similar causes, to be forthwith discharged and to stop and discharge all fines, forfeitures, etc., as also all processes, indictments, presentments, and convictions."
3. Goodwin visited his father in Emmerich in April and accompanied him to Aix in late May. They parted on 2 June, when Lord Wharton left for a tour of the German states and Goodwin went to Holland. *Autobiography*, i, 274-77; *Goodwin Wharton*, pp. 150-52.
4. See above, Ch. X, p. 18.
5. *CSPD*, Jas. II, ii, 67-68.
6. *CSPD*, Jas. II, ii, 66-67.
7. James often delayed making appointments to important Church offices--a policy for which he had both political and financial reasons. To ambitious clergymen vacant bishoprics were strong arguments for the King's policies. Vacant offices could also be sources of revenue for the government. This policy applied to Ireland as well, where James had equal authority. On 11 Mar. 1686, for example, Secretary of State Sunderland issued instructions to the Earl of Clarendon, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland: "His Majesty intends to keep the archbishopric of Cashel in his own hands, and that the revenue should be brought into the Exchequer, as also of the bishopric of Elphin if it be vacant, as he is informed it is, and would have you give the necessary orders therein." *CSPD*, *Jas. II*, ii, 64.
8. *CSPD*, Jas. II, ii, 56-58. According to the anonymous author of *The History of King James's Ecclesiastical Commission* (London, 1711), pp. 1-2, Queen Mary had prohibited preaching on controversial subjects as "the first step she made to introduce popery."
9. [John Oldmixon], *The History of Addresses*, i (1709), 136.
10. Evelyn, iv, 10. Diary entry for 5 May 1686. At the time, Evelyn was one of the Commissioners for executing the office of Lord Privy Seal. He had an apartment at Whitehall.

11. Reresby, p. 426. Entry for 18 May 1686.
12. Luttrell, i, 381.
13. For the commission granted to seven commissioners and issued, James said, "by force and virtue of our Supream Authority and Prerogative Royal," see *The History of King James's Ecclesiastical Commission*, pp. 2-6. See also, *An Exact Account of the Whole Proceedings against the Right Reverend Father in God, Henry Lord Bishop of London, before the Lord Chancellor and the other Ecclesiastical Commissioners* (London, 1688), pp. 1-6; *State Trials*, 1143-48. The appointees were Archbishop William Sancroft (who declined to serve); Nathaniel Crew, Bishop of Durham; Thomas Spratt, Bishop of Rochester; Lord Treasurer Laurence Hyde, Earl of Rochester; Sir Edward Herbert, Chief Justice of the King's Bench; Secretary of State Robert Spencer, Earl of Sunderland; and Lord Chancellor George Jeffreys, Baron of Wem. William Bridgeman was the "Register" (the official clerk). Three members, always including Jeffreys, formed an official quorum.
14. Privy Council List, PRO, PC 2/71, fol. v. See also, entry for 23 Dec. 1685, p. 179 (fol 93). On that date, the King informed the Lords "that for Reasons best known to himself" he had "thought fit to leave the Bishop of London out of the Councill And ordered his name to be struck out of the Councill Booke."
15. See James's letter to the Bishop of London, 14 June 1686, *CSPD*, Jas. II, ii, 171; *State Trials*, xi, 1155.
16. For Compton's letter to Sunderland (carried by Sharp) and Sharp's letter of explanation and apology, see *State Trials*, xi, 1155-58.
17. For the contention of the Bishop's counsel that courts of High Commission had been abolished forever by King and Parliament in 1641, see *The History of King James's Ecclesiastical Commission*, pp. 14-18. The government held that the 1641 law (17 Car. 1, cap. 11) had been superseded by an act of 1661 (13 Car. 2, cap. 12), which restored most of the powers of ecclesiastical courts. The latter act (q. v.), however, specifically continued the law against courts of High Commission. For the arguments see *State Trials*, xi, 1148-53. The Commission, which included the Lord Chancellor and the Chief Justice of the King's Bench (who had earlier ruled that the King might grant dispensations from the Test Act), scoffed at the suggestion that it was not a legal body. Bishops, Jeffreys said in effect, were to obey the King, the supreme authority, not quibble about the legality of his orders or commissions.
18. Evelyn, iv, 524. Sir Ralph Verney, among many others, looked upon the trial as a charade and the verdict as a foregone conclusion. "Let him [Bishop Compton] plead what he will," Sir Ralph wrote during a delay in the proceedings; "I beleieve it is resolved what he must suffer." Letter to John Verney, 22 Aug. 1686. Verney MSS, Claydon House.

19. On 22 Nov. 1686, Sheffield (then Earl of Mulgrave) succeeded Rochester on the Ecclesiastical Commission.
20. Written by James Drake, published in London, 1705.
21. Diary of White Kennett, 6 Dec. 1705, BL, Lansdowne MSS 1024, fol. 169. See also *The London Diaries of William Nicolson Bishop of Carlisle, 1702-1718*, ed. Clyve Jones and Geoffrey Holmes (Oxford, 1985), p. 323 (entry for 6 Dec. 1705); Abel Boyer, *The History of Queen Anne* (London, 1735), p. 218.
22. On 8 Jan. 1686, after Compton was removed from the Privy Council, Crew replaced him (PRO, PC 2/71, fol. v). He also replaced the deprived Compton as dean of the Chapel Royal. For an excellent sketch of Crew, written by Mandell Creighton, see *DNB*, v, 29-81.
23. The Archbishop, in the opinion of Sir Ralph Verney, had "got immortal Fame by not appearing" at Compton's trial. Verney to Dr. Henry Paman, 15 Aug. 1686. BL, M 636/41.
24. On 26 April 1687, John Verney informed his father that the clergy were expected [by the government] to make "an address of thanks" for the King's Declaration; and it was believed [about London] that the Bishop of Durham would "do it." BL, Verney, M 636/41. This contemptuous prediction proved correct. Crew's address was published in the *London Gazette*, No. 2243, 16-19 May 1687. In his Declaration of 4 April, aimed at breaking the power of the Establishment, James had thrown Anglicans a bone. He had promised to maintain their hierarchy and to leave their property (including abbey lands) untouched. *London Gazette*, No. 2231, 4-7 Apr. 1687. By fastening on the King's promise, Bishop Crew attempted to lessen the ignominy of his address of thanks, which in effect acknowledged the legality of the royal declaration. He thanked James for "Protecting" the Church of England "in religion and possessions." Crew's example and formula were followed by three other bishops--Thomas Cartwright, Bishop of Chester (28 May), Thomas Wood, Bishop of Lichfield (9 July), and Thomas Watson, Bishop of St. David's (3 Oct). Among the dozens of addresses which the King's agents were able to solicit from Dissenting groups, the few Anglican addresses seem pathetic and servile, and the general silence of the Anglicans seems ominous.
25. The indignation and outrage provoked by the imprisonment and trial of the seven bishops finally impelled Spratt to scramble for safety. After the acquittal, he resigned from the Ecclesiastical Commission. On 18 Oct. 1688, Crew tried to insure himself against the impending revolution by procuring "a free and general pardon" from the King for any treasons he might have committed (*CSPD*, Jas. II, iii, 323).
26. See "The Prince of Orange's First Declaration," *Parl. Hist.*, v, 3. Sunderland is not actually named in the Prince's Declaration; but he is obviously the newly-turned Catholic member of the illegal Ecclesiastical Commission and also one of James's "evil Councillors."

27. For Sunderland's maneuvers from late September 1688 until he fled to Holland in early December, see *Sunderland*, pp. 215-27. For his attempt to persuade William that in helping to render James odious he was really working to promote revolution (a view held by his Jacobite enemies), see p. 231. For his denial that he had ever turned papist, see p. 233.

28. For the text of the "Bill of Rights," approved by William and Mary on 16 Dec. 1689, see *Parl. Hist.*, v, 483-89. For excellent commentary, see Louise G. Schwoerer, *The Declaration of Rights, 1689* (Baltimore, London, 1981), 267-280. In the 1690s, Sunderland would do the Whig party some significant favors. Having turned his skin again and wormed his way into King William's confidence as a clever, unofficial advisor, Sunderland recommended a Whig ministry. William gradually replaced Tories with Whigs. By 1697, Sunderland thought he had expiated his sins and that he might step out of the shadows and accept the office of Lord Chamberlain. There were limits to gratitude, however. The Whig Junto refused to protect him against outraged Tories. Tom Wharton, who thoroughly distrusted Sunderland, argued in effect that William's government could not afford the ignominy of taking Sunderland aboard. Sunderland, for his part, thought Tom too violent a partisan to be appointed Secretary of State or Lord Deputy of Ireland. James Vernon to Charles Talbot, Duke of Shrewsbury, 23, 27, 29 Dec. 1697, *Letters Illustrative of the Reign of William III....* ed. George Payne Rainsford Jones (London, 1841), i, 446, 449-50, 452; Macaulay, vi, 2744, 2746; *Sunderland*, pp. 290-300.

29. Compton, whose code number was 31 on the invitation to the Prince, had earlier written a fervent letter of thanks for William's refusal to support James's attempts to abolish the Test Act. "The terms, by which you were pleased to express yourself in reference to the Church of England," Compton wrote, "were every way so obliging & satisfactory: that I look upon myself, as bound by duty to acknowledge the deep sense I & every true member of y<sup>e</sup> same Church ought to have of so great a blessing...." Henry Compton, deprived Bishop of London, to William Henry, Prince of Orange, 27 Oct. 1687, PRO, SP 8/1/pt. 2, fol. 160.

30. This fact was communicated to me in 1974 by the late Peter David Wheatland, then Verger of St. Giles-in-the-Fields. Lord Wharton's church was the structure of 1630, not the present building designed by Henry Flitcroft in 1731 and completed in 1733.

31. For a partial list of the notables buried at St. Giles, see Gordon Clifford Taylor, *The Story of St. Giles-in-the-Fields* (London, 1952), pp. 16-17. One notable Reverend Taylor does not mention is Mary Parish, the talented mistress of Goodwin Wharton, who was buried there in April 1703. Interestingly, in the dramatic year 1686, the list of baptisms (p. 16) includes the name of Anne Jeffreys, daughter of Lord Chancellor Jeffreys.

32. A portrait of Bishop Sharp still hangs in the rector's study, as Reverend Gordon Taylor kindly showed me.

33. For a summary account of James's children, legitimate and illegitimate, see *CP*, XII, pt. 2, 918n.

34. This point is also made by Howard Nemser, who writes: "By the autumn of 1685 it was regarded as effectively determined that there would be no breach of the principle of monarchical succession by hereditary right, nor as a practical matter would there have to be. The English would accept the temporary encumbrance of a Catholic king and would look to the prospect of his first-born Protestant daughter as their eventual queen." Nemser, "Sovereignty and the Succession in 1688-89," in Dale Hoak and Modechai Feingold, eds., *The World of William and Mary, Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688-89* (Stanford, 1996), p. 104.

35. A classic case is that of Charles Seymour, Duke of Somerset, who in July 1687 was ordered by James to introduce the Pope's nuncio Ferdinand, Count of Adda, to the court at Windsor. Somerset excused himself on the ground that to do so was against the law, which made commerce with the Pope treason. James explained that as King he was above the law and would pardon him. Somerset explained that as a subject he was not above the law and that pardons granted in advance were probably void. For his refusal Somerset was dismissed from his positions as gentleman of the bedchamber, Lord Lieutenant of Somersetshire, and colonel of a regiment. Lonsdale, pp. 23-24

36. For a good summary of the gradual relaxation of proceedings against Dissenters in 1686, see John Miller, *Popery and Politics in England, 1660-1688* (Cambridge, 1973), pp. 210-12.

37. William Denton to Sir Ralph Verney, "rec'd 4 Oct 1686," Verney MSS, Claydon House.

38. For the activities at St. Giles, see William Taylor to Lord Wharton, 29 Mar. 1686, Rawlinson 104, fol. 73; John Verney to Sir Ralph Verney, 13 Oct. 1686, and William Denton to Sir Ralph Verney, 19 Oct. 1686, Verney MSS, Claydon House. The alterations were still proceeding the following March, when Mary Wharton Kemeys told her husband that Lady Wharton would be obliged to stay in lodgings when she came to London because of the building going on "at y<sup>e</sup> famous house at St Giles." Mary Kemeys to Sir Charles Kemeys, 19 Mar. 1687, Kemeys-Tynte, No. 661.

39. Letter to John Ellis by unnamed writer, 6 Feb. 1686, *The Ellis Correspondence*, ed. George Agar-Ellis (London, 1829), i, 40-41.

40. Owen Wynne to Sir William Trumbull, 8 Feb. 1686, HMC, *Downshire*, i, 116; Luttrell, i, 371. The fact that Moxam was Irish may have helped incense the King and acquit Henry of manslaughter.

41. John Verney to Sir Ralph Verney, 9 Dec. 1686, Verney MSS, Claydon House. (John Verney mistakenly writes "Bellinger" instead of Bellingham.) See also, John Childs, *The Army, James II, and the Glorious Revolution* (New York, 1980), pp. 44.

42. Autobiography, i, 338; *Goodwin Wharton*, p. 162.

43. *Goodwin Wharton*, pp. 161-62. Goodwin's dream that Tom would help him get elected for Buckinghamshire was one of the very few of Goodwin's visions that contained an accurate (though long-range) prediction. Through Tom's influence, Goodwin was returned for Bucks in 1698.
44. Edmund Verney to John Verney, 18 April 1686, BL, Verney M 636/40; Hore, iii, 240.
45. Hore, iii, 90-91.
46. *CP*, x, 713 n. (13). It should be noted that though Anne and Tom Wharton were allotted Danvers House in the property settlement with the Berties, it was occupied throughout their marriage by the Earl of Radnor. Until the Whartons moved to Soho Square, they occupied a less elegant house nearby, in what was then "Dove Court" (the five-acre area now bounded by Danvers Street, King's Road, Old Church Street, and Cheyne Walk). Tom retained possession of this house after his move, and it was sometimes occupied by his sister Mary and her children Anne and Edmund Thomas.
47. Wharton, x, fol. 9. Nottingham and Wharton would be friends and enemies several times in their long political careers. Their most notable alliance came in December 1711 when Nottingham joined with the Whig Junto in trying to prevent the Tory government from making peace with France.
48. Carnarvon's assessment "for the Reliefe of the poore of Waddesdon" on 1 Jan. 1687 was £19, 11s. and 4d. The greatest assessment in the parish, it exceeded that of Robert Bertie, Earl of Lindsey (18:10:00) and of "the Hon<sup>ble</sup> Thom: Wharton" (08:05:00), the next largest contributors. Verney MSS, Claydon House.
49. Letters of Edmund Verney to John Verney, 4 and 11 Oct. 1686, Verney MSS, Claydon House. Both Scarsdale and Spencer, like Henry Wharton, were army officers--Scarsdale, then thirty-two, the colonel of Princess Anne's cavalry regiment and Spencer, then twenty, a cornet and guidon in the Third Troop of Horse Guards. According to Kenyon (who misdates the Carnarvon episode by a year), young Lord Spencer was a "rakehell of the worst type." He was rarely sober, and "in his cups he was a bullying lout." *Sunderland*, p. 156.
50. Edmund Verney to John Verney, 30 Oct. 1686, Verney MSS, Claydon House.
51. PRO, PC 2/71, fol. v.; *CP*, xii, In *Sunderland*, p. 142, the date is erroneously given as 5 Oct.
52. For details of the changes in the army in 1686, see HMC, *Ormonde*, i, 412-447.
53. In my opinion the best summary of Sunderland's maneuvers to displace Clarendon and Rochester (the King's brothers-in-law) and of Tyrconnel's rise to power in Ireland is that of Kenyon, *Sunderland*, pp. 131-144. The process can be followed in detail in the letters

between Clarendon and Sunderland (*CSPD*, Jam. II, ii, 69-332 passim) and in Clarendon's letters during his tenure as Lord Lieutenant in *The Correspondence of Henry Hyde Earl of Clarendon*...., ed. Samuel Weller Singer (London, 1828), i, 269-586; ii, 1-137.

54. On 17 July 1686, after the royal judges had confirmed the King's "dispensing power," James appointed four Catholics to his English Privy Council (PRO, PC 2/71, fol. v)--William (Herbert), 1st Earl and Marquess of Powis; Henry (Jermyn), 1st Baron Dover; John (Belasyse), 1st Baron Belasyse; and Henry (Arundell), 3rd Baron Arundell of Wardour. All four were political allies of Sunderland, but they distrusted Tyrconnel, whom they seem to have regarded as an irresponsible zealot.

55. For a comprehensive statement of English anxieties, see Clarendon to King James, *CSPD*, James II, ii, 237-39. Tyrconnel, says Clarendon, has displaced more than half of the Protestant army officers.

56. For Lord Wharton's property in Ireland, some of which he inherited from his father-in-law Arthur Goodwin and his wife Jane, see *CSP* (Ireland), iv, 39, 78, 121, 122, 326-27; Wharton 4, fol. 44; Carte 228 fols. 8-66 (mostly correspondence between Lord Wharton and his agent Sam Bull about the adjustment of competing claims). Above, Ch. IV, p. 1 and n.1.

57. *CSPD*, Jas. II, ii, 532. The actual warrant for constituting Tyrconnel Lord Deputy "with similar powers" to those that had been granted to Clarendon as Lord Lieutenant was issued on 5 Jan. 1687. *CSPD*, Jas. II, ii, 535.

58. PRO, PC 2/71, p. 381.

59. For the batch of commissions that Tyrconnel took with him to Ireland (66 by my count), see *CSPD*, Jas. II, ii, 339-40.

60. For an excellent discussion of "Lilliburlero" in its original and variant versions, see *Old Cause*, pp. 353-58. Carswell point outs, what is obvious upon analysis, that the lyrics are so closely tied to the events of Talbot's appointment in January 1687 that they were clearly written at that time. The fact that the song did not become wildly popular until late 1688 has caused some confusion about the dating, as has the fact that with the Revolution the song accreted many verses, generally vituperative and uninspired. In quoting the lyrics, I have used the version that Carswell took from the ballad collection BL, C. 38/1/25. *Old Cause*, pp. 354-55. For the episode when Henry Wharton sang it to King James, see below, ch. XIX, p.

61. Writing from Dublin on 22 Jan. 1687, Clarendon says, "The wind from England hath been contrary these three days, which I suppose is the reason my Lord Tyrconnel is not here, for he was to leave Chester on Tuesday last." Clarendon to Rochester, *Correspondence of...Clarendon*, ii, 137.

## ABBREVIATIONS

### 1. List of abbreviations commonly used in the citation of book titles and of manuscripts

Add.	Additional
BL	British Library
Corr.	Correspondence
<i>CSPD</i>	<i>Calendar of State Papers, Domestic</i>
<i>CTB</i>	<i>Calendar of Treasury Books</i>
<i>HCJ</i>	<i>Journal of the House of Commons</i>
HEH	Henry E. Huntington Library
<i>HLJ</i>	<i>Journal of the House of Lords</i>
HLRO	House of Lords Record Office
HMC	Historical Manuscript Commission
HS	Harleian Society
<i>IHCJ</i>	<i>Journal of the House of Commons...Ireland</i>
<i>IHLJ</i>	<i>Journal of the House of Lords...Ireland</i>
IRO	Irish Record Office, Dublin.
MS, MSS	Manuscript, manuscripts
NLW	National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth
<i>N &amp; Q</i>	<i>Notes and Queries</i>
<i>OED</i>	<i>Oxford English Dictionary</i>
PL	Pepys Library, Magdalene College, Cambridge
PR	Parish Register
PRO	Public Record Office
RCHM	Royal Commission on Historical Monuments
RO	Record Office
SP	State Papers
TCD	Trinity College, Dublin
<i>VHC</i>	<i>Victoria History of the Counties of England</i>

### 2. List of Books and Manuscripts cited by Short Titles

Addison	<i>The Letters of Joseph Addison</i> , ed. Walter Graham (Oxford, 1941).
Anglesey Diary	Diary of Arthur Annesley, 1st Earl of Anglesey--1675-1684, BL, Add. MS 18730. (The pages are unnumbered.)



Annals	Abel Boyer, <i>The History of the Reign of Queen Anne, Digested into Annals</i> , 11 vols. (London, 1703-13).
Ashcraft	Richard Ashcraft, <i>Revolutionary Politics &amp; Locke's Two Treatises of Government</i> (Princeton, 1986).
Autobiography	The Autobiography of Goodwin Wharton, BL, Add. MSS 20,006-07.
Baschet	Armand Baschet, Transcripts of reports by French ambassadors in England from originals in the <i>Affaires Etrangères</i> , PRO, PRO 31/3/1....
Baxter	Stephen Bartow Baxter, <i>William III and the Defense of European Liberty, 1650-1702</i> (New York, 1966).
Biog. Univ.	<i>Biographie Universelle, Ancienne et Moderne...</i> , 2nd edn., 45 vols. (Paris, 1843-65).
Burnet	Gilbert Burnet, <i>Bishop Burnet's History of His Own Time</i> , ed. Martin Joseph Routh, 2nd edn., 6 vols. (Oxford, 1833).
<i>Calamy Revised</i>	Arnold Gwynne Matthews, <i>Calamy Revised</i> (Oxford, 1934).
Carte	Bodleian Library, Carte MSS.
CB	<i>Complete Baronetage</i> , ed. G. E. C.[okayne], 5 vols. (Exeter, 1900-6).
Clark	Sir George Norman Clark, <i>The Later Stuarts, 1660-1714</i> , 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1955).
CP	<i>The Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain, and the United Kingdom</i> , ed. G. E. C.[okayne], rev. ed., 12 vols. (London, 1910-59).
Dalrymple	Sir John Dalrymple, <i>Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland</i> , 2nd ed., 2 vols. (London, 1771-73).
Dalton	<i>English Army Lists and Commission Registers, 1661-1714</i> , ed. Charles Dalton, 6 vols. (London, 1892-1904).
Danby	Andrew Browning, <i>Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby and Duke of Leeds</i> , 3 vols. (Glasgow, 1944, 1951).
DBF	<i>Dictionnaire de Biographie Française</i> , eds. J Balteau, M Barroux, M.

Prévost, et al. (Paris, 1929--).

<i>DNB</i>	<i>Dictionary of National Biography.</i>
E. R. Wharton	Edward Ross Wharton, <i>The Whartons of Wharton Hall</i> (Oxford, 1898).
Evelyn	<i>The Diary of John Evelyn</i> , ed. Esmond Samuel de Beer, 6 vols. (Oxford, 1955).
Fox	Charles James Fox, <i>A History of the Early Part of the Reign of James the Second</i> (London, 1808).
<i>Goodwin Wharton</i>	J. Kent Clark, <i>Goodwin Wharton</i> (Oxford, 1984; repr., London, 1989).
Granger	<i>Letters between the Rev. James Granger...and Many of the Most Eminent Literary Men of His Time</i> , ed. J. P. Malcolm (London, 1805).
Grey	Anchitell Grey, <i>Debates of the House of Commons from the Year 1667 to the Year 1694</i> , 10 vols. (London, 1763).
Halifax	<i>The Works of George Savile Marquis of Halifax</i> , ed. Mark N. Brown, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1989).
<i>Hatton</i>	Correspondence of the Family of Hatton, ed. Edward Maunde Thompson, 2 vols. (Westminster, 1878); Camden Society Pub., N. S., vols. xxii, xxiii.
<i>HC, 1660-90</i>	<i>The House of Commons, 1660-1690</i> , ed. Basil Duke Henning, published for History of Parliament Trust, 3 vols. (London, 1983).
Holmes	Geoffrey Shorter Holmes, <i>British Politics in the Age of Anne</i> (rev. ed., London, Ronceverte, 1987).
Hore	John Philip Hore, <i>The History of Newmarket, and the Annals of the Turf</i> , 3 vols. (Newmarket, 1885- 1886).
Japikse	<i>Correspondentie van Willem III en van Hans Willem Bentinck</i> , ed. Nicolaas Japikse, 5 vols. ('S-Gravenhage, 1927-37).
Kemeys-Tynte	NLW, Aberystwyth, Wales, Kemeys-Tynte MSS.
Kennett	White Kennett, <i>A Complete History of England</i> , 3 vols. (London, 1706).

Kenyon	John Philipps Kenyon, <i>The Popish Plot</i> (London, New York, 1972).
Langley	Thomas Langley, <i>The History and Antiquities of the Hundred of Desborough</i> (London, 1797).
Lonsdale	Cumbria RO, Carlisle, Lonsdale MSS.
Luttrell	Narcissus Luttrell, <i>A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs from September 1678 to April 1714</i> , 6 vols. (Oxford, 1857).
Macaulay	Thomas Babington Macaulay, 1st Baron Macaulay, <i>The History of England from the Accession of James the Second</i> , ed. Sir Charles Harding Firth, 6 vols. (London, 1913-15).
Macky	John Macky, <i>Memoirs of the Secret Services of John Macky, Esq.</i> (London, 1733).
Marlborough-	<i>The Marlborough-Godolphin Correspondence</i> , ed. Godolphin Henry L. Snyder, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1975).
<i>Memoirs</i>	<i>Memoirs of the Life of the Most Noble Thomas, Late Marquess of Wharton</i> (London, 1715). [Anonymous, but very probably by John Oldmixon.]
Mignet	François August Marie Alexis Mignet, <i>Négociations Relatives à la Succession d'Espagne sous Louis XIV</i> , 4 vols. (Paris, 1835-42).
NBG	<i>Nouvelle Biographie Générale...</i> , 46 vols. (Paris, 1855-67).
Ogg	David Ogg, <i>England in the Reign of Charles II</i> , 2nd ed., 2 vols. (Oxford, 1955).
<i>Old Cause</i>	John Carswell, <i>The Old Cause</i> (London, 1954).
<i>Parl. Diary</i>	<i>The Parliamentary Diary of Narcissus Luttrell, 1691-1693</i> , ed. Henry Horwitz (Oxford, 1972).
<i>Parl. Hist.</i>	<i>The Parliamentary History of England</i> , ed. William Cobbett, 36 vols. (London, 1806-20).
POAS	<i>Poems on Affairs of State, Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660-1714</i> , gen. ed., George de F. Lord, 7 vols. (New Haven, Conn., 1963-75).

<i>Pol. State</i>	Abel Boyer, <i>The Political State of Great Britain</i> 60 vols. (London, 1712-40).
Rawlinson	Bodleian Library, Rawlinson MSS.
<i>Recueil</i>	<i>Recueil des Instructions Données aux Ambassadeurs et Ministres de France...</i> , vol. xxv, <i>Angleterre</i> , ed. J. J. Jusserand (Paris, 1929).
Reresby	Memoirs of Sir John Reresby, ed. Andrew Browning (Glasgow, 1936).
Romney	Henry Sidney, Earl of Romney, <i>Diary of the Times of Charles the Second</i> , ed. Robert Willis Blencowe, 2 vols. (London, 1843).
<i>Sacheverell</i>	Geoffrey Shorter Holmes, <i>The Trial of Doctor Sacheverell</i> (London, 1973).
<i>Shaftesbury</i>	Kenneth Harold Dobson Haley, <i>The First Earl of Shaftesbury</i> (Oxford, 1968).
Speck	William Arthur Speck, <i>Reluctant Revolutionaries, Englishmen and the Revotution of 1688</i> (Oxford, New York, 1988).
Sprat	Bishop Thomas Sprat, <i>A True Account and Declaration of the Horrid Conspiracy against the Late King, His Present Majesty, and the Government</i> (London, 1685).
<i>State Trials</i>	<i>A Complete Collection of State Trials</i> , ed. T. B. Howell, 21 vols. (London, 1811-26).
<i>Sunderland</i>	John Phillips Kenyon, <i>Robert Spencer, Earl of Sunderland, 1641-1702</i> (London, New York Toronto, 1958).
<i>Surv. London</i>	Greater London Council, <i>Survey of London</i> , vol. i--(London, 1900--).
Swift, <i>Corr.</i>	<i>The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift</i> , ed. Harold Williams, 5 vols. (Oxford, 1963-6).
Swift, <i>Prose</i>	<i>The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift</i> , ed. Herbert Davis, 14 vols. (Oxford, 1939-66).
Tankerville	Ford Grey, 3rd Baron Grey of Warke and 1st Earl of Tankerville, <i>The Secret History of the Rye-House Plot: and of Monmouth's Rebellion, Written by Ford Lord Grey, in MDCLXXV</i> , 1st edn. (London, 1854).

- Trevelyan            George Macaulay Trevelyan, *England Under Queen Anne*, 3 vols. (London, 1930-34).
- Verney                Bucks. RO, and BL, microfilm collection of Verney family letters in Claydon House.
- Wharton              Bodleian Library, Wharton MSS.
- Wood                  *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood, antiquary, of Oxford, 1632-1695, described by Himself*, ed. Andrew Clark, 5 vols. (Oxford, 1891-1900).

## RECENT HUMANITIES WORKING PAPERS

149. Kevles, Daniel J. and Geison, Gerald L. "The Modern Experimental Life Sciences: Needs and Opportunities for Historical Research." October 1991.
150. Cancelled.
151. Kevles, Daniel J. "Renato Dulbecco and the New Animal Virology: Medicine, Methods, and Molecultes". June 1992.
152. Flamming, Douglas. "Regression Options for Historians: Choosing Among OLS, Tobit, and Probit Models." September 1992.
153. Flamming, Douglas. "Daughters, Dollars and Domesticity: Family Wages and Female Autonomy in American Textiles, Evidence from the Federal Survey of 1908." September 1992.
154. Kevles, Daniel J. "The Enemies Without and Within Cancer and the History of the Laboratory Sciences." March 1993.
155. Kevles, Daniel J. "Nuclear Power: An American Failure." July 1993
156. Clark, J. Kent. "Protestant in Masquerade." March 1994.
157. Kevles, Daniel J. "Diamond V. Chakrabarty and Beyond the Political Economy of Patenting Life." February 1994.
158. Cooke, Kathy J. "Science and Art Among the Chickens: Practical Breeding in the Work of Raymond Pearl." December 1994.
159. Clark, J. Kent. "Anne Wharton." January 1995.
160. Cancelled.
161. Clark, J. Kent. "Outrages." August 1995.
162. Clark, J. Kent. "Seizures." October 1995.
163. Clark, J. Kent. "Exits." April 1996.
164. Kennefick, Daniel. "Controversies in the History of the Radiation Reaction Problem in General Relativity." August 1996.
165. Winter, A. To be announced.
166. Clark, J. Kent. "Gallopings." April 1997.